(ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.)

besides income derived from lands which they enjoy'' ಎಂದು ಉತ್ತರ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಹನುಮಯ್ಯ.—(ಬ) ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಉತ್ತರವಾಗಿ 'ಇಲ್ಲ' ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ಅವರನ್ನು ಕರೆಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೇ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಕರೆದರೂ ಜುಲುಂ ಮಾಡಿದ ಹಾಗಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಪಿ. ಪಾಟೀಲ್.—ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಕೆಲಸದ ದೆಸೆಯಿಂದ ಅವರನ್ನು ಕರೆದಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದು ತಪ್ಪಲ್ಲ. ಖಾಸಗೀ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಕರೆದರೆ ಅವರು ಹೋಗಬಾರದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಹನುಮಯ್ಯ.—ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಮತ್ತು ಹೈದರಾಬಾದು ಪ್ರಾಂತಗಳಿಂದ ಮೈಸೂರು ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿರುವ ತೋಟಿ ತಳವಾರರುಗಳಿಗೇನು ಸಂಭಾವನೆ ಕೊಡಲಾಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಪಿ. ಪಾಟೀಲ್.—ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಪತನ್ ಜಮಿನಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಹನುಮಯ್ಯ.—ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಬಳ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲವೆ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಪಿ. ಪಾಟೀಲ್.—ಇಲ್ಲ.

Sri A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY.—Is paying a 'Mirase' compulsory ?

Sri M. P. PATIL.—I think it is so, but I would like to have notice.

Sri A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY.—Does not such a provision exist in the Act, Sir ?

Sri M. P. PATIL.—I think so.

Sri A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY.—If that is so, are these revenue officials assisting the Thoties and Thalaries to collect 'Mirasi' from the ryots, Sir.

Sri M. P. PATIL.—When complaints are received that would be looked into.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಎ. ತಿಮ್ಮಪ್ಪಗೌಡ.—ಹಿಂದಿನ ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಗ್ರಾಮ ನೌಕರರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಪೋಟಿಗಿ ಗೊತ್ತು ಮಾಡಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ವರ್ಷವಾಯಿತು ?

Sri M. P. PATIL.—That question does not really arise, but, as far as I know, the 'Potgi' was revised twice in the old Mysore State.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—Has it come to the notice of Government that the returns from lands entrusted to the Thoties and Thalaries are utterly inadequate for their maintenance ?

Sri M. P. PATIL.—It may be, but it is a suggestion for action.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—I want a definite answer, not a 'may be'. Are the Government aware that the returns are inadequate. I would be satisfied if the Government says that they know of it or that they do not know of it. But 'may be' is not an answer.

Sri M. P. PATIL.—The circumstances differ from place to place. In some places it may be adequate and in others not so.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—In places where the returns are inadequate, what action Government proposes to take to see that enough facilities are given to these people for discharging Government duties ?

Sri M. P. PATIL.—It is a suggestion for action. As a matter of fact, the Hon'ble Member may be knowing that the whole matter is under the consideration of Government.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಹುಚ್ಚಮಾಸ್ತಿಗೌಡ.—ಪಟೇಲ ಶ್ಯಾನುಭೋಗರ ವಿಷಯ ವಿಮರ್ಶೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದಾಗಿ ರಾಜ್ಯಪಾಲರ ಭಾಷಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ತೋಟಿ ತಳವಾರರ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ವಿಮರ್ಶೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಾ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಪಿ. ಪಾಟೀಲ್.—ಹೌದು, ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳೂ ಬರುತ್ತವೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪ್ರಭಾಕರ್.—ಮಿರಾಸೆ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯೆಂದರೆ ಅರ್ಥವೇನು ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಮೈಸೂರಿನವರಿಗೇ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ನಮಗೆ ಹೇಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ?

Sri K. PRABHAKER.—I want to have a legal interpretation from the Government, Sir.

Sri M. P. PATIL.—'Mirasi' means 'Ayyah' ಅಯಾ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪ್ರಭಾಕರ್.—ಎಕರೆಗೆಷ್ಟು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಗೊತ್ತುಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಪಿ. ಪಾಟೀಲ್.—ನೋಟೀಸ್.

Affairs pertaining to the R.M.D.C.

Q.—155. **Sri P. R. RAMAIYA** (Basavangudi).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) whether the R.M.D.C. Crosswords have been submitting to Government acconnts periodically according to law ;

(*b*) whether it is a fact that adverse observations have been made by the Audit Department in respect of the accounts submitted by the R.M.D.C. ;

(*c*) whether the defects have been rectified ;

(*d*) if not, the action they have taken on the R.M.D C. ;

(*e*) whether they contemplate investigating into the affairs of the R.M.D.C. ?

A.—Sri M. P. PATIL (Minister for Revenue).—

(*a*), (*b*), (*c*), (*d*) & (*e*). In view of the proceedings pending in the District Court, Civil Station, and the Supreme Court in which the validity of the local Act and the Central Act is questioned, the matter is *sub judice*.

Sri P. R. RAMAIYA.—The reply that the matter is 'sub judice' is not satisfactory, Sir. I would like to know at what stage the proceedings are now in the courts.

Sri M. P. PATIL.—The proceedings are going on. I would require notice to point out at what stage the proceedings are.

Sri P. R. RAMAIYA.—This question was asked a long time ago. I would like to know the facts and at what stage the proceedings are. Question (*a*) askes if the R.M.D.C. have been submitting accounts according to law. As far as I know that matter is not *sub judice*.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Minister's answer is that the whole matter is *sub judice*.

Sri P. R. RAMAIYA.—The issue whether the Company has been submitting accounts required under law, is not a matter that is *sub-judice*, Sir.

Sri M. P. PATIL.—The Company is submitting the periodical accounts.

Sri P. R. RAMAIYA.—In part (*b*) of the question it is asked if the Audit Department has made some adverse observations. What is the Minister's answer to this ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The reply is : that since the whole matter is *sub-judice*, the Minister cannot give a reply.

Sri M. PALANIYAPPAN.—May I know the grounds on which the R.M.D.C. Company approached the courts ? Is it on the question of issue of licences to R.M.D.C. or for the submission of accounts to Government required under the law ?

Sri M. P. PATIL.—The Company has questioned the validity of both the Central and State laws in this respect.

Sri M. PALANIYAPPAN.—Is it not a fact that the Company has questioned the basis of issue of licence and not the submission of accounts ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The entire State and Central Acts have been challenged.

Sri M. PALANIYAPPAN.—The Company has challenged the State and Central acts so far as the conduct of the competitions go. The question is whether the accounts were audited or not.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I must say that if the Hon'ble Member wants to put a question, he may put a straight question. I do not understand why the Hon'ble Member is arguing.

Sri M. PALANIYAPPAN.—Is it not a fact that the R.M.D.C. company has challenged the Central and State Acts only and it has not said anything about the submission of Accounts, in the Districts, Civil and Supreme Courts.

Sri M. P. PATIL.—I have already stated that it has challenged the validity of both the Acts.

1-30 P.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—When the whole Act has been challenged everything is challenged. As I understand, both the Acts, the State Act and the Central Act, have been challenged and naturally the R.M.D.C. is not entitled to give accounts.

Sri V. R. NAIDU.— Point of order Sir, 155ನೇ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ R.M.D.C. ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಚಿವರು ಉತ್ತರದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಈ ವಿಷಯವು ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತು ಸುಪ್ರೀಮ್ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾಗದೆ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಕೇಳಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಕೂಡದು ಅಲ್ಲವೇ ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೂ Point of order ಇಲ್ಲ. ನಿಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಮಾತ್ರ ನೀವು ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ.

I have accommodated the members to a great extent. When questions were called, the members were absent. I allowed the question to be put afterwards as a matter of grace. But the time they have taken is enormous. We have extended the time by 20 minutes. It is not fair to give more time because we have to finish the other part of the business.